AMERICAN FEDERATION OF LABOR

WEEKLY NEWS SERVICE

Entered as second-class matter September 30, 1912, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of August 24, 1912.
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Sec. 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized July 12, 1918.

WHOLE NO. 1217 | WILLIAM GREEN, President | WASHINGTON, D. C., SATURDAY, AUGUST 11, 1934 | FRANK MORRISON, Secretary | VOL. 24, NO. 32

Whenever you hear a man disuading you from attempting to do well on the ground that perfection is "Utopian," beware of that man.—Ruskin.

COMPULSORY MEMBERSHIP IN COMPANY UNION HELD ILLEGAL BY LABOR BOARD

Orders Tamaqua Underwear Officials to Reinstate 61 Members of Clothing Workers' Union Who Were Fired Because They Refused to Join Fake Labor Union.

Washington.—The National Labor Relations Board, in a unanimous decision signed by Chairman Lloyd Garrison, Edwin S. Smith and Harry A. Mills, ordered the Tamaqua Underwear Co. at Tamaqua, Pa., to reinstate 61 members of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, affiliated with the American Federation of Labor, who were discharged because they refused to join the company union promoted by the firm.

According to the record in the case, a majority of the employees of the Tamaqua company, at an election held June 29 under the direction of the Philadelphia Regional Labor Board, voted in favor of the company union.

In its decision the Labor Board criticized company officials and company union leaders. "A collective bargaining agreement which provides merely for the closed shop," the board said, "is an oddity in the annals of industrial relations."

Section 7-A Quoted

Pointing out that Section 7-A of the National Recovery Act provides that "no employee and no one seeking employment shall be required as a condition of employment to join any company union," the board said the sole question before it was whether the Tamaqua employes' union "is a company union within the intent of Section 7-A."

Compulsory Membership Imposed

According to the board's history of the case, the following agreement was signed on June 5 by Dr. Auchmuty for the company and Allison L. Hallman, president of the company union:

"It is hereby agreed that the Tamaqua Underwear Co. agrees to recognize the demand of the Tamaqua employes' union for a closed shop, beginning June 27, 1934."

The board added:

"On June 25, the Monday following the elections, when the 61 members of the Amalgamated Clothing Workers of America, affiliated with the A. F. of L. came as usual to work, they were told by Dr. Auchmuty that they would be refused their old jobs unless they joined the company union. This 61 of them have not done and are accordingly denied employment by the company."

Bosses Fostered Union

Although the board did not attempt to decide "the validity of a closed shop agreement with a bona fide labor union," the decision held that "the hands which guided the organization of this union were those of employers who were, in an executive or supervisory capacity, and its present destinies are controlled not by the female stitchers and cutters, of which almost the entire membership is composed, but by an assistant floor lady, Mrs. Evans; a comparatively well-to-do businessman, a salesman, and a male employe of the shipping department."

"If Dr. Auchmuty did not initiate the union," the board said, "he has at least fostered its growth with considerable enthusiasm by advising his employes to affiliate therewith and by permitting it to use the good will of the company and his office equipment for certain typing."

The board found "improper" that "the organization of the union negotiated the closed shop agreement with Hallman, it seems, consulting the membership, and obtained the consent of Dr. Auchmuty without debate or deliberation."

The board gave the company 10 days to reinstate the 61 discharged employes to the same rights as previously enjoyed.

BAN ON HARRIMAN MILLS IS ASKED BY A. F. OF L.

Executive Council Urges Johnson to Repudiate Glancy's Act in Restoring Blue Eagle to Concern Which the NRA Found Guilty of Discriminating Against Union Employes.

Atlantic City, N. J.—A. R. Glancy, NRA divisional compliance representative, was recently restored the Blue Eagle to the Harriman Hosiery Mills, Harriman, Tenn., was strongly condemned by the Executive Council of the American Federation of Labor in session here Glancy's settlement at the time it was made public received the condemnation of the Harriman's striking employes, the Labor Advisory Board of the NRA and of President Green of the A. F. of L.

The Council instructed Mr. Green to demand of General Johnson, Recovery Administrator, that the Blue Eagle be withdrawn, and that the case be transferred to Divisional Administrator George L. Berry, president of the Printing Pressmen's and Assistants' Union, for handling.

Formal action on the Harriman case was taken by the Executive Council after Mr. Green had made a complete report of the issues in the controversy, which began last July 16 when company officials refused to bargain collectively with a committee of unionized employes.

The Executive Council unanimously endorsed the work of Mr. Green in the case, and criticized the restoration of the Blue Eagle by Mr. Glancy several weeks ago. It charged that although Major Berry had been given authority to negotiate a settlement with the strikers, Mr. Glancy had interviewed and had arranged an unsatisfactory agreement with the company without General Johnson's authority, and without consulting Major Berry.

Test of Section 7-A

Mr. Green, in announcing the Executive Council's decision, said the Harriman case was considered by organized labor as a test of Section 7-A of the National Industrial Recovery Act. He added:

"Labor now demands that General Johnson repudiate the action of Mr. Glancy. Labor demands that the agreement under which Major Berry was given full authority to settle the controversy be carried out, and that the Blue Eagle be removed until the company complies with the collective bargaining provisions of Section 7-A of the Recovery Act.

"I am directed by the Council to present to the matter of general labor's return and to call on him, accordingly, to withdraw the Blue Eagle and to see that the unauthorized action of Mr. Glancy may be repudiated.

"I am sure General Johnson returns and we can meet with him, we will present our proofs to the consultants in a test case, which will show whether or not the Blue Eagle may be restored to a company that has refused to bargain collectively, as provided in Section 7-A of the Recovery Act."

After the departure of General Johnson for the West, he said, Mr. Glancy negotiated "some sort of settlement" with the company, which allegedly provided for the return of 25 strikers and the hiring of 10 new employes. Mr. Green he added, Mr. Glancy agreed to restore the Blue Eagle "without consulting Major Berry, the strikers or the union officers."

WAGES

Editor's Note.—For a considerable period the Union of Post Office Workers of Great Britain has endeavored to persuade the British Postmaster General to increase the wages of its police employes. Mr. Francis Andrews, editor of The Post, the union's official organ, in an editorial on "Wages" gives a fine economic analysis of the necessity of higher wages for post office workers in particular and for working men and women generally.

By FRANCIS ANDREWS
Editor, The Post, Official Organ of the British Union of Post Office Workers

Post office people, as a whole, do not get enough pay to enable them to maintain efficient and worthy, while many of them are miserably poor. Indeed so many of them are poor that to be "well off" in a class can bring no satisfaction. The coldness of official parties cannot thaw, nor can official courtesies hide these human factors for long.

An impersonal calculagraph philosophy with regard to living men and women may have *its* uses; but in the end, wages, bread and butter, roofrees and rent have to be spoken of face to face, and the story they tell has to be told in simple English. It is to tell that story that our representatives ask to be received. • • •

The arithmetic of a wage issue is a matter of addition, but the philosophy of it is deeper. Our people give the greater part of their lives to work, and concentrate upon it their attention and enthusiasm. **A world like ours, in which poverty is a preventable disease, should offer in return for the service given an adequate and happy existence as far as it may go.**

There is more than that in it. It is not really a case of a gracious gift; it is an economic necessity that the great mass of the people should be buying and consuming.

The highly productive State, with its power to deliver the goods, has no justification whatever unless it can distribute as efficiently as it produces. If that efficiency in production is not there for the betterment of the common life it is being debased to other causes, and in the end will destroy production itself. To all thinking folk that is self-evident.

A wage claim is but the demand that common sense shall prevail. Therefore a wage claim seek for wider and better distribution of the produce of life. Wider and better distribution is everywhere demanded. To be sad because of crises that wage claims should be refused, but to prevent crises that they should be conceded.

Is it not true that if the people of Britain had shared steadily, and step by step, in the advancing prosperity throughout the years of industrial development, the whole world would have developed differently, and that no money crisis would have arisen? That seems a sweeping question, but it is in accord with ascertainable history.

EUROPEAN EMPLOYERS BLOCK 40-HOUR WEEK TO PROVIDE WORK FOR JOBLESS

Editor's Note.—W. R. Townley, General President of the National Union of Boot and Shoe Operatives of Great Britain, was one of the Labor representatives to the recent International Labor Conference at Geneva, which included in its agenda the shorter work week as a method of providing jobs for the unemployed in countries ravished with the League of Nations. The following excerpt from Mr. Townley's report to his own organization emphatically points out the subversive attitude taken on shorter hours by most employers whose Governments are represented in the International Conference.

By W. R. TOWNLEY
General President National Union of Boot and Shoe Operatives

The first question, and the one which attracted most attention, was that of the reduction of hours of work. The interest which it aroused throughout the world has certainly not decreased since the time when it was first reviewed. As a possibility of arriving at a Convention for a 40-hour working week, extensive preparatory work had been carried out in collecting evidence, and data to assist the Conference in arriving at positive conclusions.

Arguments Against 40-Hour Week

The opening discussion on this question, after reaching the Committee stage, revealed the strong opposition of several of the employers' delegates to make a change in the reducing working hours.

The main points presented by them can be summarized as follows: That we had very strong defects as to its remedy for the imperfections of employment. There was the fear that certain industries might experience financial difficulties and even be obliged to close down, owing to the inevitable increase in cost of production. Other industries will suffer from a smaller demand, and the measure would thus create unemployment. There was also the increase in the cost of production. This increase will be greater if the weekly earnings are maintained and would seriously affect selling prices, even in the most favorable cases, if the hourly wages remained unshanged. The increased cost of production will lead to further nationalization and gradually